

So let's talk about myth, let's talk about facts, and let's get beyond all of this and say seniors of this country have chosen overwhelmingly to stay in Medicare. They like Medicare. It works. It just does not cover prescription drugs.

Mr. HARKIN. Will the Senator from Michigan yield for a question?

Ms. STABENOW. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HARKIN. First, I preface my question by thanking the Senator from Michigan for her depth of understanding of the whole Medicare issue and also for her clarity of argument. I should say her clarity of exposition, for exposing what this is all about. It is not about tinkering around with it; it is really about an assault on the Medicare system itself. So I thank the Senator from Michigan for pointing that out, and I hope the Senator will continue to do this so that the American people understand what this is really about. It is about a fight for Medicare, whether we are going to have it.

Now, my question is this: As the Senator pointed out, Mr. Scully and others, back when Medicare+Choice came in, were lauding it, saying we were going to see seniors pouring into managed care Medicare. The Senator talked about how Mr. Scully said this was going to be an Oklahoma land rush to move to private health plans, and the Republicans who put up Medicare+Choice had all of these visions that seniors would go into it. But as the Senator from Michigan pointed out, that did not happen, did it? It did not happen.

Ms. STABENOW. That is correct.

Mr. HARKIN. Now we only have 11 percent of seniors who chose that. I ask the Senator from Michigan, does it somehow appear that since voluntarily the Republicans could not get seniors into HMOs and private health care plans, there now seems to be an approach that we are going to force them into HMOs by doing away with the Medicare system and restructuring it into a private HMO type system that would force the elderly to do what the elderly do not want to do? Does that seem to be the kind of thing we see laid out in front of us?

Ms. STABENOW. Well, I think my colleague is very wise in pointing that out. I often say that seniors made their choice and now our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have said: We do not like that choice. Pick again. You cannot have this choice. Door No. 1 is closed and locked. You can only pick door No. 2. That is really what is happening. Even among the fancy words, now we are hearing that under Medicare there will be the same prescription drug proposal, the same plan as our private plans; we are going to give the same prescription drug plan. But then we hear, but other things will be better in the private sector plans, such as we will have more prevention; we will have a better catastrophic cap; we will have other things that are better. So they are moving the words around.

It may appear that the prescription drug part is the same, but other things will be better because of the belief—and there is a genuine philosophical difference, there is a divide, about what is the best way to proceed. There are colleagues who believe that probably Medicare should never have been enacted. I have heard it said it is a big government program, it should be private insurance run, and they would like very much to get back as close as they can to a privately run system.

Mr. HARKIN. Again, I thank the Senator for pointing this out. As the Senator knows, the majority of Republicans voted against Medicare when it came in, in 1965. Even my good friend Senator Dole, when he was running for President, said he voted against Medicare and he was proud of it.

Now I would give them that that is their philosophy, and that is where they are coming from. I understand that. I understand when Newt Gingrich says he wants to have Medicare wither on the vine. I understand when the third ranking Republican in the Senate says the Medicare benefit ought to be done away with. That is their philosophy and that is where they are headed.

So again, I thank the Senator for pointing out that this is really the goal.

Ms. STABENOW. Absolutely.

Mr. HARKIN. This is the goal that is out there, to destroy the Medicare system.

Ms. STABENOW. Absolutely.

Mr. HARKIN. Again, I ask the Senator from Michigan, when Medicare came in, was it not because the private sector had failed in terms of elderly health care in America?

Ms. STABENOW. Absolutely.

Mr. HARKIN. Was that not the history? And if one has these private plans, that they are going to pick and choose, and they are going to cherry pick, and they are going to have a segregation of elderly pushed off in some corner someplace, begging for some kind of health care if we do not have a universal Medicare system? Is that not what might happen?

Ms. STABENOW. I think the Senator is absolutely correct. It is not that there is not a place for private sector insurance, but when Medicare came into place, it was because half the seniors in the country could not find a private plan that would cover them or they could not afford it. So there was such a huge need.

We as Americans have a basic value about making sure older Americans can live in dignity and have access to health care and a quality of life that they deserve, as well as those who are disabled. This is a great American value. I believe it is a great American success story. Even though there are those who since that time have been trying in some way to undermine it, we should be proud as a country. I absolutely agree with colleagues who say it needs to be modernized. We can focus more on prevention strategies.

In addition to prescription drug coverage, there are other ways we can make the system better. We can use more technology, less paperwork, all of which are good. If we could get beyond the debate that says we should move back toward the private sector, and somehow that is cost effective and saves money and the dollars will go further—none of which is true; there is no evidence of that—if we could get beyond that, we could come up with a bipartisan plan that would be meaningful. The seniors have been waiting for us to get the message. They want Medicare. They just want prescription drug coverage. They want it modernized. But they want Medicare. They have been saying that loudly and clearly.

I hope we can get the message and work together to actually get it done.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Senator for her leadership on this issue.

Ms. STABENOW. We appreciate the opportunity to share this today.

We have a real opportunity here, as Members on both sides of the aisle, to do something very meaningful. I hope we will do that rather than debate whether or not Medicare has been successful and seniors want choices. I believe we should look at the choice they made. It is very clear. They want us to work together and get something done, and do it in a way that will allow seniors to know that medicine, which is such a critical part of their lives and a great cost to their pocketbook, will be covered or partially covered and they will receive some assistance to be able to afford such a critical part of health care today, which is outpatient prescription drugs. It is too important to people. We do not want them choosing between food and medicine in the morning. We want them to have confidence that Medicare will cover and help with the costs of prescription drugs.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will report H.R. 1588 by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1588) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2004 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities